



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,419	07/09/2003	Bajko Gabor	39700-580001US/NC39543US	7976
64046	7590	09/29/2010	EXAMINER	
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111				HOANG, DANIEL L
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2436				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,419	GABOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANIEL L. HOANG	2436	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,12,26,28,31,33,35,37-39 and 42-57 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 5-8, 12, 26, 28, 31, 33, 35, and 37-39, 42-57 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

1. As per applicant's arguments and amendments, the previous action's 101 and 112 rejections have been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the previous action's 103 rejections are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the following:

- a) Pirttimaa does not disclose a single security association being valid over a plurality of IP addresses wherein the security association is valid between the user equipment and the node for a plurality of different IP addresses.

In response to a), examiner agrees and thus relies on the Egevang reference to teach that limitation. Applicant has acknowledged this.

- b) Egevang does not disclose a single security association being valid over a plurality of IP addresses wherein the security association is valid between the user equipment and the node for a plurality of different IP addresses.

In response to b), please see examiner's response below in the 103 rejection. The rejection has been amended to cite a different portion of the Egevang reference.

- c) in regards to Egevang, the nodes 110 and 112 cannot constitute user equipment because the node comprises a call state control function.

In response to c), this appears to be a moot argument as the Pirttimaa is used to teach the user equipment and the node comprising a call state control function. Please see the 103 rejection below.

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 12, 26, 28, 31, 33, 35, and 37-39, 42-57 are presented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 12, 26, 29, 31, 33, 35, and 37-39, 42-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirttimaa (US PGP No. 20030154400), and further in view of Egevang, US Patent No. 7159109.

As per claim 1 and 26, 29, 31-32, 38, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method comprising:

Forwarding, by a user equipment, a prefix value to a node in a packet switched environment to create a security association with the node based on the prefix value, said prefix value referring to a portion of a internet protocol address, wherein the node comprises a call state control function.

[see paragraph 40, 42] UE140 is interpreted as the first node, P-CSCF is interpreted as the second node, the SIP register message with address included is interpreted as the prefix value being forwarded.

[see also paragraph 3, "serving call state control function"]

The Pirttimaa reference has been discussed above. While Pirttimaa teaches a method of setting up a security association, Pirttimaa is mute in teaching that the security association is valid for a plurality of different internet protocol addresses, each of said plurality of internet protocol addresses comprising said portion of the first internet protocol address to which the prefix value refers.

For this limitation, examiner relies on the Egevang reference. Egevang teaches a method for managing address translation for secure connections. See col. 8, lines 22-67 and col. 9, lines 1-29, wherein Egevang teaches first setting up a security association for communication between network node 102 and Router 106. Network nodes 110 and 112 communicate with router 106 with their own internal addresses in order to send packets to node 102. Router 106 sets up a security association to communicate with node 102. When nodes 110 or 112 communicate with router 106, router 106 translates their internal addresses into a common external address using address translation in order to communicate packets to node 102. The security association is set up for both inbound and outbound traffic. Once the security association is set up for router 106, both nodes 110 and 112 may use the same security association without the need to set up separate security associations. Examiner views this to be analogous to the limitation claimed by applicant above. It is clear that the security association is valid for multiple IP addresses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention taught by Pirttimaa to include setting up a security association that is valid for multiple IP addresses, as taught by Egevang, in order to improve management of a Security Association by improving the overall capacity and performance of the network (Egevang, col. 2, lines 3-30).

As per claim 2 and 42, 52, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the packet switched environment is a IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) of a 3rd generation (3G) network, wherein the prefix value defines a range comprising the plurality of different IP addresses.

[see paragraph 2]

[see also paragraphs 40 and 42, wherein Pirttimaa teaches the prefix value and see the above rejection of claim 1 wherein Egevang teaches the plurality of different IP addresses.]

As per claim 3 and 43, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first node is User Equipment (UE).

[see rejection of claim 1]

As per claim 53, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second node is a Proxy Call State Control Function (P-CSCF)

[see rejection of claim 1, "P-CSCF"]

As per claim 5 and 45, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the message is a protocol message.

[see rejection of claim 1, "SIP Register"]

As per claim 6 and 46, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 5, wherein the protocol is a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP).

[see rejection of claim 5]

As per claim 7 and 47, 55, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the message is a SIP REGISTER message.

[see paragraph 40]

As per claim 8 and 48, 56, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the prefix value is included in a header of the message.

[see rejection of claim 1 wherein the SIP register message includes the address in the header.]

As per claim 12, Pirttimaa teaches:

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the prefix value is allocated by a gateway general packet radio service support node.

[see paragraph 42, wherein the prefix is derived from a received IP datagram conveying the SIP message]

As per claim 49 and 57, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the header is a Security-Client header.

[see paragraph 42]

As per claim 50, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 9, wherein the prefix value is included in an extension parameter of the Security-Client header.

[see rejection of claim 8]

As per claim 51, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the prefix value is allocated by a Gateway GPRS Support Node (GGSN).

[see paragraph 4]

As per claim 28 and 44 and 54, Pirttimaa teaches:

A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the forwarding of the prefix value from the first node to the second node comprises forward the prefix value in a message.

[see rejection of claim 1 wherein the prefix value is sent in a SIP request message]

As per claim 33, 35, 37, and 39, Pirttimaa teaches:

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first internet protocol address and another of the plurality of internet protocol addresses, are internet protocol addresses of the same apparatus.

[see paragraph 43]

CONCLUSION

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

POINTS OF CONTACT

*. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulaney Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

*. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1019. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2136

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Daniel L. Hoang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Eleni A Shiferaw/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436